

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION

UNILOC USA, INC., ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ELECTRONIC ARTS, INC.,

Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CAUSE NO. 6:13-CV-259

VERDICT FORM

In answering these questions, you are to follow all of the instructions I have given you in the Court's Charge.

1. Did Uniloc prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Origin Entitlements infringes claim 19 of the '216 patent?

Yes ✓ (proved)

No \_\_\_\_\_ (not proved)

*Please continue to Question 2.*

2. Did Uniloc prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it marked substantially all of the products it made, offered for sale, or sold under the '216 patent, and that Uniloc made reasonable efforts to ensure that all of its licensees who made, offered for sale, or sold products under the '216 patent marked the products?

Yes ✓ (proved) No \_\_\_\_\_ (not proved)

*If you have answered "Yes" to Questions 1 and 2, then you should answer Question 3 for infringement, if any, between August 8, 2012 and September 21, 2013 when the patent expired.*

*If you have answered "Yes" to Question 1 and "No" to Question 2, then you should answer Question 3 for infringement, if any, between March 21, 2013 and September 21, 2013 when the patent expired.*

*If you have answered "No" to Question 1, please do not answer Question 3.*

3. What sum of money, if paid now in cash, do you find from a preponderance of the evidence would fairly and reasonably compensate Uniloc for infringement of claim 19 of the '216 patent by EA?

\$4,863,925.00

12/5/2014  
Date



(Foreperson Signature)